







# The Review.

---

VOL. X.

ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 17, 1903.

NO. 35.

---

## THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT OF THE CHURCH.

**T**HE fifth commandment of the Church is, "To contribute to the support of our pastors." In the Old Law, God Himself had prescribed that those chosen to serve the altar, namely, the entire tribe of Levi, should be supported, not by the cultivation of lands assigned them, as the other tribes were, but by appointed offerings of the people: "I have given to the sons of Levi," he said, "all the tithes of Israel for a possession, for the ministry wherewith they serve Me in the Tabernacle of the Covenant" (Num. xviii, 21). In the New Law, the Church has made, in the different nations and ages, such provisions for the support of the clergy as circumstances required. The precept itself is founded on the law of nature. For, as St. Thomas argues, reason dictates that, as those who watch over the common good, such as princes and soldiers, are entitled to a stipend for their support, thus also those who are employed in the worship of God for the benefit of the whole people, should be supplied by the people with whatever is necessary for their support.

He next explains more fully how this support is to be understood, saying: "A priest is appointed to be a sort of middleman and mediator between God and the people, as we read of Moses (Deut. v, 5, 27); and therefore it belongs to him to deliver the divine decrees to the people; and again, that which comes from the people, in the way of prayers, and sacrifices, and offerings, ought to be paid to God through the priest. And therefore the offerings that are made by the people to God belong to the priests; not simply to convert them to their own use, but also to dispense them faithfully, partly by expending them on what belongs to divine worship, partly on what belongs to their own maintenance, because 'Those that serve the altar partake with the altar' (I. Cor., ix, 13), partly also for the use of the poor, who are to be support-



ed, so far as possible, out of the property of the Church, because our Lord also had a purse for the use of the poor, as Jerome says" (2a 2ae, q. 86; Aquin. Eth. ii, p. 138).

In the New Law, Christ has made for the support of the clergy a similar provision to that made in the Old Law; for in sending His Apostles, He bade them rely for support on those to whom they should preach, reminding them that "The workman is worthy of his meat" (Math. x, 10). St. Paul insists with much earnestness upon the corresponding duty of the faithful to support their pastors, saying: "Who serveth as a soldier at any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? . . . . If we have sown unto your spiritual things, is it a great matter that we reap your carnal things? . . . . They that serve the altar partake with the altar. So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel" (I. Cor. ix, 7-14).

In the early ages of the Church, no certain amount was appointed as due to the clergy, but the spontaneous gifts of the faithful supplied what was needed. Later on, the payments of tithes, that is of a tenth part of the produce of the land, was required by many councils, especially in the ninth century. The piety of kings and nobles, and of the faithful generally, endowed the churches and monasteries so richly in the course of time that there was enough for altar, priest, and religious, as well as for the poor. But at the time of the Reformation, those in power seized all those incomes and the estates themselves, wherever Protestantism gained the ascendancy. In the countries that have remained Catholic, the governments have since seized upon the patrimony of the Church and of the poor. As a partial restitution for this, they now pay an annual salary for the support of the clergy. In this country, and in others similarly situated, there is no such provision made, and therefore the natural duty of supporting religion rests entirely upon the faithful. By calling it a natural duty we mean that it is not merely a pious practice or a counsel of perfection, but that it so binds the consciences of Catholics, that neglect in this matter is a sin, and may be a grievous sin.

This support of religion comprises: *a.* adequate provision for a church and its appointments; for sacred vessels and all the other requisites of divine worship. *b.* Decent sustenance of pastors, suitable, namely, to their character as bishops and priests, and to their social standing as representatives of the Catholic religion before the world. *c.* The erection, equipment, and maintenance of schools for the religious education of the young. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore directs (n. 202) that "much

zeal and prudence should be employed to eradicate from the minds of the laity the notion that care of the schools concerns only those parents who directly and actually make use of those schools."\*)

Religion demands sacrifice, and people who are not willing to do much for the Church, certainly do not prize very highly the benefits they derive from the Church. To do good is all that we are here for, and surely one can do no greater good and enjoy no greater honor than to help build and maintain temples wherein God is properly honored. Do away with Catholic churches, and I think God would speedily do away with the world.

How much do you give to your church?—you who complain that church dues are too high? thirty to forty dollars a year? That appears to be a big amount, but it is only about ten cents a day. Do you smoke? The price of one good cigar laid aside every day, would pay your church dues. Do you drink? The price of one bottle of beer put aside every day, would pay your church dues. The butter you put on your bread would about pay them, and yet you grumble over the amount,—though we have seen that nothing on earth is so useful and necessary to us as the Church is.

My dear friend, by your little outlay you make it possible for the truth of God to be preached in your locality, for Christ to dwell in your midst as truly as He dwells in Heaven; you draw upon yourself God's blessings, receive His graces, which are worth more than all the world. You are assisted on to Heaven. Do you get your \$40 worth? You could never give as much to the Church as you receive from her. God assures us that He will not allow Himself to be outdone in generosity; but remember, "He who soweth sparingly, will also reap sparingly."



### MASONRY AS THE DEPOSITOR OF "DIVINE TRUTH."

The eighth degree or that of Royal Master is as persistent as the others in urging on us the nature of the quest of Masonry.

"Throughout all the symbolism of Masonry," we read on p. 508 of Mackey's *Ritualist*, "from the first to the last degree, the search for the Word has been considered but as a symbolic expression for the search after Truth. The attainment of this Truth has always been acknowledged to be the great object and design of all Masonic labor. Divine Truth—the knowledge of God—concealed in the old Cabalistic doctrine, under the symbol of his Ineffable Name, and typified in the Masonic system, under the

\*) We reproduce the above chapter from Fr. Coppens' latest book, 'A Systematic Study of the Catholic Religion' (B. Herder), both for its intrinsic value and to give our readers a specimen of the reverend author's style and method

of treatment. What follows is taken (with a few verbal changes) from 'Kind Words From Your Pastor,' by Rev. J. F. Noll, also reviewed in this No. of THE REVIEW.

A. P.



mystical expression of the True Word, is the reward proposed to every Mason who has faithfully wrought his task. It is, in short, the "Master's wages."

Do not marvel, dear reader, that Masonry seeks the knowledge of divine truth—the nature and essence of God—from old Cabalistic and pagan sources. Masonry, in its works, is never ashamed of such parentage. The interpretation of the "Blazing Star" as the Star of Bethlehem was "too sectarian" for the universal religion of Masonry; a pagan school or a Jewish sect suits it perfectly! Remark, moreover, that the true Word of Masonry is not the true Word of St. John in his Gospel, for this Word is the Word made flesh in Bethlehem; a Word too sectarian, as we have seen, for Masonry. Besides, it is plain that Christ is not the Word to be sought from the progenitors of the Craft, pagan philosophers or Jewish mystics. Nevertheless as we seek "the Word that was made flesh," and as this search constitutes the essence of Christianity, so Masonry indulges in its own search after its own word, and makes this the essence of its religion. A further citation, though a little lengthy, will throw additional light on the question of Masonry's religion and the Masonic concept of divine truth.

"In all the initiations into the mysteries of the ancient world," says our Ritualist, p. 509, "there was, as is well known to scholars, a legend of the violent death of some distinguished personage, to whose memory the particular mystery was consecrated; of the concealment of the body and its subsequent discovery. The part of the initiation which referred to the concealment of the body was called the 'aphanism,' from the Greek word which signifies 'to conceal'; and that part which referred to the subsequent finding was called the 'euresis,' from another Greek verb which signifies 'to discover.' It is impossible to avoid seeing the coincidence between this system of initiation and that practised in the Masonry of the third degree. But the ancient initiation was not terminated by the euresis or discovery. Up to that time the ceremonies had been funereal or lugubrious in their character. But now they were changed from wailing to rejoicing. Other ceremonies were performed by which the restoration of the personage to life or his apotheosis or change to immortality, was represented, and then came the autopsy or illumination of the neophyte when he was invested with a full knowledge of all the religious doctrines which it was the object and design of the ancient mysteries to teach—when, in a word, he was instructed in Divine Truth."

The Ritualist deserves our sincerest thanks for speaking to us so plainly. The mysteries of which it treats, and with which the



coincidence of Masonry is so evident that it can not but be perceived, are the old pagan mysteries of the East: and these, Masonry tells us, were the mediums of "Divine Truth" to man. In the autopsy or illumination which they contained, the neophyte "was invested with a full knowledge of all the religious doctrines which it was the object and design of the ancient mysteries to teach—he was, in a word, instructed in divine truth."

But let us continue the quotation :

"Now a similar course is pursued in Masonry. Here also there is an illumination, a symbolical teaching, or, as we call it, an investiture with that which is the representative of Divine Truth. The communication to the candidate in the Master's degree of that which is admitted to be merely a representation of or a substitute for that symbol of Divine Truth, the search for which under the name of the true word makes so important a part of the degree, however imperfect it may be, in comparison with that more thorough knowledge which only future researches can enable the Master Mason to attain, constitutes the autopsy of the third degree. Now the principal event recorded in the degree of Royal Master, the interview between Adoniram and his two Royal Masters, is to be placed precisely at that juncture of time which is between the euresis or discovery in the Master Mason's degree and the autopsy or investiture with the great secret. It occurred between the discovery, by means of the sprig of acacia, and the final interment."

When discussing, in a former paper, the quotation from the prophet Ezechiel relative to the letter tau, we mentioned "the branch" of Masonry as identical with that reprobated by the prophet. Have some perhaps thought that we were drawing on our imagination? Listen to what our author has to say on the subject in his 'Encyclopædia of Freemasonry,' pp. 8-9, under the heading "Acacia":

"In all the ancient initiations and religious mysteries there was some plant peculiar to each which was consecrated by its own esoteric meaning and which occupied an important position in the celebration of the rites, so that the plant, whatever it might be, from its constant and prominent use in the ceremonies of initiation, came at length to be adopted as the symbol of that initiation. Thus the lettuce was the sacred plant which assumed the place of the acacia in the mysteries of Adonis. The lotus was that of the Brahminical rites of India and from them adopted by the Egyptians. The Egyptians also revered the erica or heath; and the mistletoe was a mystical plant among the Druids. And, lastly, the myrtle performed the same office of symbolism in the mysteries of Greece that the lotus did in Egypt or the mistletoe among the Druids.



"In all these ancient mysteries while the sacred plant was a symbol of initiation, the initiation itself was symbolic of the resurrection to a future life and of the immortality of the soul. In this view, Freemasonry is to us now in the place of the ancient initiations, and the acacia is substituted for the lotus, the erica, the ivy, the mistletoe and the myrtle. The lesson of wisdom is the same—the medium of imparting it is all that has been changed."

We shall not at present dwell further on the subject, lest we needlessly prolong our present series of articles, which has but this one point in view—to prove that Masonry is a religion. Another quotation, therefore, and we are done. It will be from the ninth or last degree, that, namely, of Select Master.

"The great object of all Masonic labor," repeats our author, pp. 549-550, "is divine truth. The search for the lost word is the search for truth. But divine truth is synonymous with God. The Ineffable Name is a symbol of truth because God is truth. It is properly a scriptural idea. . . . If then God is truth and the stone of foundation is the Masonic symbol of God, it follows that it must also be the symbol of divine truth. When we have arrived at this point in our speculations, we are ready to show how all the myths and legends of the stone of foundation may be rationally explained as parts of that beautiful 'science of morality, veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols,' which is the acknowledged definition of Freemasonry.

"In the Masonic system there are two temples; the first temple, in which the degrees of ancient Craft Masonry are concerned, and the second temple with which the higher degrees and especially the Royal Arch, are related. The first temple is symbolic of the present life; the second temple is symbolic of the life to come. The first temple, the present life must be destroyed; on its foundations the second temple, the life eternal, must be built. . . .

"But although the present life is necessarily built upon the foundations of truth, yet we never thoroughly attain it in this sublunary sphere. The foundation stone is concealed in the first temple, and the Master Mason knows it not. He has not the true word. He receives only a substitute.

"But in the second temple of the future life we have passed from the grave which had been the end of our labors in the first. We have removed the rubbish and have found that stone of foundation which had hitherto been concealed from our eyes. We now throw aside the substitute for truth which had contented us in the former temple and the brilliant effulgence of the tetragrammaton and the stone of foundation are discovered and henceforth we are possessors of the true word—of divine truth. And in this way the stone of foundation or divine truth concealed in the first



temple, but discovered and brought to light in the second, will explain the passage of the Apostle: 'For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.' And so we arrive at this result, that the Masonic stone of foundation, so conspicuous in the degree of Select Master is a symbol of divine truth upon which all speculative Masonry is built, and the legends and traditions which refer to it are intended to describe in an allegorical way the progress of truth in the soul, the search for which is a Mason's labor, and the discovery of which is to be his reward."

With this quotation let us for the time being quit "the sacred retreat" (p. 551), the "holy ground" (p. 23) of the lodge, to recover somewhat from "the shock of entrance" and the subsequent outspoken avowals of Masonry.

22 22 22

### BOOK REVIEWS.

*A Systematic Study of the Catholic Religion*, by Charles Coppens, S. J. Author of *Lectures on Moral Principles and Medical Practice*, and *Text-Books on Logic and Metaphysics*, *Moral Philosophy*, *Oratory*, *Rhetoric*. St. Louis, Mo. 1903. Published by B. Herder, 17 S. Broadway. xiii+370 pp.  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$  in. Price, retail, \$1.

This new manual of our holy religion combines brevity with clearness, fulness, and correctness of doctrine. Just such a compendium has long been needed in our colleges, where it is the received practice to teach religion to the more advanced students by lectures rather than recitations from text-books. The reverend author, whose knack of writing ideal college text-books is unsurpassed, has in this volume followed the general scheme of Hunter's 'Outlines of Dogmatic Theology' and used much of the special information contained in that very able work. With his usual ability and painstaking diligence, assisted by his long experience as a teacher, he has succeeded in constructing a manual which will not only render excellent service as a text-book for class recitation, but also as a means of private study without the aid of any teacher.

2

*Kind Words From Your Pastor*. By Rev. John F. Noll, New Haven, Ind. 71 pages.  $5 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$  in. Price, \$4 per 1,000.

These are heart-to-heart talks of a zealous pastor with his people. They comprise chapters on many practical subjects, such as church support, the parochial school, mixed marriages, secret societies, etc., and we are pleased to say, are thoroughly sound in doctrine. The style, however, might be improved. The circulation of a pamphlet like this in any parish must be productive of good results.



## A GERMAN CRITICISM OF BISHOP SPALDING.

Rev. P. Alexander Baumgartner, S. J., a scholar of international repute and the leading Catholic authority on the life and literary works of Goethe, in the current (sixth) fascicle of the justly famous *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, reviews the German edition of Rt. Rev. Bishop J. L. Spalding's 'Opportunity.'\*) He says:—

"Culture," "civilization," "progress," "liberty," "science," "education," "person," "love"—are the catch-words which stand out from these addresses like fire-balls in a brilliant shower of sparks. We are nowhere clearly told what these catch-words mean, nor does the author present or prove any definite theses with regard to their signification. We have a chain of glittering thoughts, ruled by esprit and sentiment rather than calm thinking. At one moment we imagine we are reading Ruskin, then Emerson; again we are faintly reminded of the very latest French apologetics, mixed with aphorisms from Montaigne and Rousseau, Bacon and Kant, Wordsworth and Goethe. Real Catholic thinkers and poets are hardly ever quoted, except in so far as the modern world will accept them, or as they seem to approach modern views by some occasional utterance. The Middle Ages lie far, far behind these 283 pages,†) buried in deepest gloom; it is only with the nineteenth century that those "achievements" begin which "thrill us with a sense of gratitude and wonder." "In its hundred years man has made greater progress than in any preceding thousand" (p. 45.) Not only in the natural sciences: "It is especially in the matter of education that the superiority of one age over all others is most manifest." The strangest thing of all is that "Goethe as educator" forms the height of modern achievement. Of the ten addresses comprising this volume, two (one-sixth of the whole book) are devoted to him in this rôle, while the following sings his praises as a "patriot." "Goethe, who never utters a foolish thing, says that in time of peace patriotism properly consists merely in this,—that each one sweep before his own door, attend to his own business, learn his own lesson, that it may be well in his own household, etc." (pp. 199-200.)

Every one knows that Goethe did not succeed in educating Christiana Vulpius, whom he received into his house in 1788, and married in 1806, to write orthographically, much less to participate actively in his spiritual life. It is equally well known how fatal a purely aesthetic home training proved to his son August. Hundreds, aye thousands have allowed the example and unlimited fame of Goethe to confirm and soothe them in the fatal view that a man may attain the highest degree of culture, may live a life most eminently human, and derive therefrom the greatest possible amount of gratification—without positive Christianity. "Goethe," says Cardinal Hergenröther, "who was equally eminent in nearly every branch of poetry, filled his readers with enthusiasm for the ancient culture of Greece and for earthly beauty; he was a

\*) Opportunity and Other Essays and Addresses by J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria. Second Edition. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1901. (Our quotations are from this edition.) The German edition: Gelegenheit. Anreden

des Msgr. J. L. Spalding, Bischofs von Peoria (Nordamerika). Autorisierte Uebersetzung aus dem Englischen von Isidor Heneka, Missionspriester. Mit dem Portrait des Verfassers. München: Schuh & Cie. 1903.

†) 228 in the English edition.



thorough-going naturalist, declared himself to be no Christian, and even hated Christian ideas. In his writings we have everywhere plastic perfection, sensual delight, variety of pleasures, unmeasured deification of the poet's own *ego*; but no understanding of the life of nations, the sublimity of divine revelation and the Church; no trace of the fear of God and that divine love which inspired the medieval minnesingers." This being the case, the Catholics of America and of the whole world should have been spared the unreasonable demand to receive "Goethe as educator."

We must call it a serious mistake that these essays and addresses have been turned into German. By their haziness, their mixing of Catholic and "modern" ideas, of the truth with falsehood and inaccuracy, they can do only harm. Whosoever feels an inclination to read them, should not neglect to take the well-known address of Bishop Dr. Keppler of Rottenburg as an antidote.

On the subject of "university education," by the way, these addresses betray equally queer views as on "seminary training," which of course does not fit in with "Goethe as educator." Thus we read on page 91:

"Disputes of theologians, like all quarrels, interest mainly the participants; others they annoy or scandalize. They spring less from the love of truth than from the narrow and unsympathetic temper which is often found in the professional mind and which has wrought infinite evil in the world. Medicine, law, and theology, when followed simply with a view to practice, are not liberal studies; they rather restrict the mental horizon and subdue the mind to what it works in, unless it first be rendered supple, open, and luminous by philosophy, which is liberal knowledge, a gentleman's knowledge, and a chief scope of university teaching."

It is hardly possible that the Rt. Rev. author means to refer here to the Scholastic philosophy, which includes in its method as an essential feature the form of disputation. He does not tell us what kind of a philosophy it is that constitutes the knowledge of a gentleman. The professional representatives of the various sciences will no doubt be very thankful to His Lordship for striking them from the list of gentlemen. We suppose Ralph Waldo Emerson and Goethe will have to take the place of St. Thomas, for the benefit of the ladies.

\* \* \*

Thus P. Baumgartner. This crushing criticism, and the praise recently accorded to Msgr. Spalding's writings by such arch-liberal and anti-Catholic papers as the *Cologne Gazette*, (which declared among other things that in Europe a Catholic bishop could not utter such ideas and sentiments without exposing himself to general and severe criticism by his fellow-Catholics) have, we fear, annihilated completely whatever long-distance reputation His Lordship of Peoria may have previously enjoyed in Catholic Germany.

## A NEW PLAN FOR OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Commander Frederick Booth Tucker, head of the Salvation Army in America, has recently addressed a circular letter to various railroad companies and other large corporations, setting forth in detail a plan for an old age pension system, which, he says, would do away with all difficulties on that question.

His idea is that the money now expended in old-age pensions by the great corporations and in military pensions by the government, would bring a far greater income to the pensioners and would impose a far less burden on the payers, if expended in scientific colonization of the beneficiaries. He is led to this conclusion by the results of the last four years in the three farm colonies of the Army—Fort Amity in Colorado, Fort Romie in California, and Fort Herrick in Ohio.

The land at Amity, valued at \$81,000, when the Army purchased and resold it to the colonists in 1899, has now a market value of \$200,000. Individual colonists have sold for \$200 an acre land which they bought in 1899 from the Army for \$40. The land at Romie has increased from \$53,000 to \$75,000, and that at Herrick from \$14,000 to \$20,000.

The first colonists reached Amity in the spring of 1899. The increased value which their residence and labor has given the land, has already insured the Army against loss, should the colonists never make another payment. It has only to take back the land and sell it at its increased valuation to more than recoup itself for all outlay. But there is no necessity for doing anything of the kind. Colonists who arrived penniless at Amity four years ago, without any property except their household goods, are to-day occupying little farms of their own, free from incumbrance, having discharged their entire debt to the Army. One man has a twenty-acre farm, with a neat stone cottage erected by himself. He paid his debt to the Army, amounting to \$900, in three years, besides supporting himself, a wife, and three children, and building his house. The Business Men's Club at Amity last year turned over \$200,000, and paid \$50,000 in freight. This fact alone demonstrates, to Commander Booth Tucker, how the railroads could build up communities of freight payers along their lines out of their own pensioners.

These colonists were supplied with railroad fare for themselves and families to the colony. They were given the land, the implements to work it, the seed to plant, and the animals to stock it, and a roof to cover their heads until they could build their own houses, without a dollar of payment down. But every cent of it was a charge against them. The Army had borrowed the capital,



and was under strict necessity of getting its money back, although at no time did it desire to make any money out of the colonists.

The Army has found the average cost to be \$500 apiece to settle these families and put the bread-winner in a position to cultivate his land. It is on this basis of \$500 apiece that Commander Booth Tucker figures out his pension plan.

To recommend his scheme still more, the Salvation Army leader shows the enormous amount of money required by the Carnegie scheme, our own and England's old soldiers' pensions, as also by the old age pensions of Germany, and withal their inefficiency to grant full relief. But Mr. Booth Tucker forgets that in his plan no cripple can be relieved; he forgets, too, that men who up to the age of 50 or 60 have not done farm work, will not be quite ready to undertake it then, or if they undertake it, will likely make a failure of it.

This scheme may prove successful under certain conditions and thus help to solve the old age pension question, but it will hardly be considered by railroads and other large corporations as *the* solution of a problem which is giving them much concern.

28 28 28

## THE "ROMAN CATHOLIC MUTUAL PROTECTIVE SOCIETY OF IOWA."

This organization was incorporated November, 1899, under the assessment laws of Iowa. Its constitution and by-laws were recently submitted to THE REVIEW for an opinion regarding its merits from an insurance point of view.

We regret the somewhat ambiguous language of the stipulations in the pamphlet submitted to us, for instance in the articles of incorporation, §4: "The private property of the members shall not be liable for any debts or liabilities of the society. The amount of indebtedness shall in no case exceed one hundred dollars. . . ."

Whose liability is here restricted? Can the society not go into debt for more than one hundred dollars? Or is the members' obligation limited to that amount? Then again, in article IV. of the constitution, under the head "Funds," we read: "The Beneficiary Fund shall consist of assessments paid by each member with the initiation fee and afterwards on the death of each member (as provided in section 3 hereof). . . ." Now in section 3 we find: "The assessments for the Beneficiary Fund shall be made as follows: Three full assessments are to be made on the first of each month on all members in good standing."

The question naturally arises: Must a member pay 3 assess-

ments each month, making 36 a year, regardless of the number of deaths, or is a threefold assessment to be levied on the first of the month following the death of a member with no limitation as to number? A correct answer will give an opportunity of figuring on the the possible cost per member, since a table of graded assessments for the different ages is attached.

If the item of cost is uncertain, the benefit payable in case of a member's death to the beneficiary is still more so. Section 6 headed "Death Beneficiary" is quoted here in full:

"Upon the death of a full-rate member of the society, there shall be paid to the person or persons legally entitled thereto a sum equal to one general assessment, less 10% for the sinking fund. Upon the death of a half rate member, one-half of one general assessment, less 10% for the Sinking Fund; but in no case shall the amount so paid exceed \$2,000 for full rate members, or \$1,000 for half rate members."

To discuss such a proposition from a life insurance point of view, is simply impossible. The society does not assume any obligation for a stated amount, but merely agrees to collect a "general assessment" (whatever that may mean) and hand over the proceeds, less 10% for a sinking fund, provided such proceeds do not exceed \$2,000 and \$1,000 for full and half-rate members respectively. No minimum amount is given, so the result depends entirely upon the willingness of the members to respond to an assessment call, and as the members under article IV. of the constitution are exempt from liability for any debts of the society, failure to respond means merely the loss of money to the hopeful beneficiary, who will correspondingly gain in valuable experience regarding the workings of "mutual life insurance."

A system of that description may be organized charity, but it certainly is not life insurance. If the members of this society understand the full meaning of the certificates given to them, well and good; but if they are under the impression that they hold policies of life insurance, it is the plain duty of their officers to promptly inform them of the true state of affairs, in order to avoid disastrous consequences and deserved censure.



Loring says in his 'Orators of Boston' (p. 19) that he recollects seeing the "Procession of the Pope and the Devil" on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot as late as 1774, at Taunton, Massachusetts. "Effigies of these two illustrious personages," he declares, "were paraded around the Common, and this was perhaps the last exhibition of the kind in our country." (See some interesting notes on Pope-Day in America in No. 3 of Griffin's *Historical Researches*.)



## MINOR TOPICS.

*The Ancient Fable of Count Gleichen and His "Tripartite" Marriage* has been revamped by the *Chicago Tribune*. A subscriber sends us a cutting from that paper's issue of August 28th, with a request to state the facts. The cutting reads:

"Count Gleichen, who lies buried in the Cathedral of Erfurt, is on record as having been the only Christian nobleman who ever enjoyed the sacramental privilege from the Roman Catholic Church of being married to and living with two wives at the same time. Indeed, the tomb of the count in the Erfurt Cathedral represents him as kneeling between his two wives.

"The old Count had been a crusader and having been taken prisoner was set at liberty by the Sultan's daughter on the condition that he would take her with him in his flight and marry her according to the rites of his own religion. Beggars can not afford to be choosers, so the Count consented, and on reaching Europe went to Rome to consult the Pope as to what he was to do, having already a wife in Germany. The Holy Father, after due consideration, decided that the Count must fulfill his pledges, all the more as the Turkish princess had promised to become a Christian if the Count married her. Together the couple proceeded to Germany, where the German countess, realizing that but for the Saracen princess she would never have seen her beloved husband again, consented to the tripartite union sanctioned by the Pope, the three living together happily ever afterwards."

Those who have the 'Geschichtslügen' or Döllinger's 'Papstfabeln des Mittelalters' need not be told by THE REVIEW that this story of Count Gleichen is a venerable and oft-exploded hoax. But it seems these useful books are rare in America, and so it may be worth while to comply with our friend's request.

The value of the fable for anti-Catholic writers and readers lies in the alleged papal dispensation permitting bigamy. The facts are said to have occurred towards the middle of the thirteenth century, but there is no mention of them anywhere before the beginning of the sixteenth. Johannes Janssen has proved that Philip of Hesse mentioned the case of the alleged Gleichen dispensation in his request (which was granted) to Luther and Melancthon to allow him to cohabit with two women. (Gesch. d. deutschen Volkes, iii, 403 sq.) Schauerte shows in his work 'Die Doppelhehe eines Grafen von Gleichen' (Frankfort on the Main, 1883) how the fable spread and grew, and how contradictory the various versions of it are in nearly every detail.

The tomb in the Cathedral of Erfurt, representing a man between two women, proves nothing. Already Bayle said in his famous 'Dictionnaire' (tom. ii, art. "Gleichen") that it may just as well mean that the man buried there was married twice in succession. Döllinger thinks ('Papstfabeln,' p. 35) that the figures on the tomb really gave rise to the fable itself, and he adds in a note that Placidus Muth of Erfurt has shown it to be very probable that the monument in the Erfurt dome is that of a Count of Gleichen who died in 1494, after having had two wives in succession.

The authors of the 'Geschichtslügen' conclude their chapter on

this subject as follows: "Nevertheless the 'pilgrimages' to the Erfurt Cathedral will not cease so soon, and the pathetic story will continue to be believed by those into whose world-view such fables fit. On the other hand, every sensible man will see that this fable, which was intended as a weapon against the Holy See, and calculated at the same time to excuse the conduct of the Reformers which violated both divine and human law, is nothing but one of the numerous lies of history."

*About Pius X.*—From an Italian clergyman who is well acquainted with the new Pontiff we have this information: "It was by an evident intervention of divine Providence that Giuseppe Sarto was elected to the papacy, for a supreme effort had been made to bring about the election of another cardinal, which would have proved unfortunate. The new Pope is sincerely pious and filled with great zeal. He is not a *savant*, but has always held the safest doctrines and kept aloof from dangerous movements. He is very good, very sweet-tempered, has never been engaged in great controversies and does not love them; but he will perform his duty according to the dictates of his conscience, without human respect. He is no "diplomat" and will not engage in diplomatic dealings. He has no love for the innovators, though a few of the more moderate of them number among his friends. From the height of St. Peter's chair he will surely see farther and deeper than he has been able to see hitherto. Certain American coryphaei may possibly succeed in gaining his favor for a while, but it is not very probable; and if it should happen, they will most assuredly not hold it long."

*"Non Talibus Auxiliis."*—The question of the appointment of another cardinal in this country seems to be agitating various clerics in the Province of New York, if one may judge from the articles appearing from time to time in the *Sun* laudatory of Archbishop Farley and evidently inspired by his friends, who apparently desire to create a public opinion favorable to his appointment.

The latest of these emanations, appearing in the *Sun* on August 25th, reports what "several prominent visiting prelates" said, and especially what "one of the bishops" told the reporter, as well as what "one of the monsignori" stated. Included in the statement of one of the bishops (name not given) were the following remarks:

"On the other hand there are personal reasons why Pope Pius would probably prefer the honor to come to New York's Metropolitan. Archbishop Farley has been practically the founder and for many years the head of the work of the St. Vincent de Paul Society which is the pride of Pope Pius' life. What Archbishop Farley has done in founding and spreading this work for the poor in New York has been duplicated in Venice by the Pontiff when he was Cardinal Sarto."

These statements, notwithstanding their respectable origin, were not allowed to pass unchallenged. We find a spirited protest in the *Sun* of September 2nd, from which we cull a few sentences:

"When we are told in the *Sun* of the 25th that Archbishop Farley is to be chosen Cardinal, according to the opinion of certain "visiting prelates" (unnamed), whom it quotes, and whose wish is evidently father to the thought, we make no comment.



Perhaps these gentlemen have advance information on the subject and their prediction may be correct. But when, in addition, we read that one, if not the chief reason, why the Holy Father should select Msgr. Farley for this high honor, is that the Archbishop "has been practically the founder" of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, we Catholics of an older generation, who know what the great Archbishop John Hughes did in this Diocese, are bound, in justice to his memory and in the interest of truth, to deny that Archbishop Farley founded this great charitable society, and we assert that the credit and the merit of this good work belongs of right to Archbishop Hughes, who established the society in this Diocese in the year 1848."

Follows a letter of recommendation addressed to his people by Archbishop Hughes in 1848, together with statistics showing the growth of the society under his administration.

Archbishop Farley's friends are hardly serving him to advantage when their indiscreet praise provokes such a reply. Passing that question, is it necessary that there should be so much drum-beating to reconcile New Yorkers to the idea of their Archbishop being made a Cardinal?

The *Denver Catholic* (Aug. 15th) claims that THE REVIEW, in its article on the C. M. B. A. in No. 31, did not quote the rates correctly, and as usual, calls us all sorts of names, of which "ignoramus" is the least offensive. For the information of our readers we copy here the explanatory lines in our article:

"..... and last the charges of the C. M. B. A. according to Mr. Brown's statement. We do not know whether he has quoted the C. M. B. A. rates correctly, but if so, the rates are much too low for safety."

Logically, all the remarks of the *Denver Catholic* addressed to THE REVIEW, apply to Mr. Brown, whose article was printed in the official organ of the C. M. B. A. without any comment or correction by the editor of that journal. Under these circumstances we shall hereafter ignore any statement made by the *Denver Catholic* or the *C. M. B. A. News*, and confine ourselves to the discussion of insurance matters on the basis of official reports from the various insurance departments and such information as may be furnished by the officers of the societies referred to over their signatures in an official capacity.

President Roosevelt addressed recently the Holy Name Society of Brooklyn with a sermon on "Strenuous Christianity." For an assembly of pupils of a military school the talk might have been appropriate, but for Catholic adults it sounds strange to be told that "We have good Scriptural authority for the statement that it is not what comes into a man's mouth, but what goes out of it, that counts."

Evidently the laws of "fast and abstinence" would not find favor in Mr. Roosevelt's eyes.

Again, "..... Life to be worth living, must be a life of active and hard work."

Most of the Saints in the calendar would be deprived of their



crowns in heaven, if the President's standard were to prevail there.

To expect from the members of a religious society organized for the main purpose of reducing profanity in speech, that their work should make them "fitter to fight in time of war," is only another illustration of Mr. Roosevelt's tact and his wonderful conception of "the eternal fitness of things."

Under the heading, "Cheating the Indians," the daily press is discussing extensive frauds practised upon the Indian Rights Association. "The Indians have been fleeced mercilessly by sharpers. This has been done with the knowledge, if not with the actual complicity, of the representatives of the government." So says the *Philadelphia Record*, and closes with the observation: "There seems to be no part of the federal service that does not need a legal overhauling."

Bearing in mind the evidences of corruption in army and navy contracts during the American-Spanish war, the scandals in the postal service recently discovered, the condition of affairs existing in the Pension Bureau, it were indeed interesting to know, if there is any branch of the federal service "above suspicion."

Even Justice David J. Brewer of the Supreme Court of the United States is amused at the "diplomacy" of President Roosevelt in dealing with Russia. He says in an article contributed to *Leslie's Weekly*:

"Our government recently forwarded to Russia a petition in respect to alleged atrocities committed upon the Jews. That government, as might have been expected, unwilling to have its internal affairs a matter of consideration by other governments, declined to receive the petition. If, instead of so doing, it had replied that it would put a stop to all such atrocities when this government puts a stop to lynchings, what could we have said?"

That the petition was a bid for the "Jewish vote," and nothing else intended.

At the recent convention of the Federation of the German Catholic Societies of California, in San Francisco, Archbishop Montgomery delivered a sermon, in which he said (*California Volksfreund*, Sept. 4th): "The schools are not divine, as the Church is a divine institution, but in order that we may profit by the truth, we must take the means to the end, and, as practical Catholics, recognize the parochial schools as a necessity. I say not this because I am speaking to you; the German Catholics of the United States have set an example even in the matter of parochial schools for their children; they deserve this public recognition, which I gladly give, and I hope and trust you may continue in the good work."

According to the *Philadelphia Record* (August 27th) Bishop Dougherty of Nueva Segovia, P. I., on his way to his new field of labor, "will confer with Archbishop Ireland at St. Paul regarding a Philippine policy." We do not know if he has done so, but make bold to enquire: Since when has Archbishop Ireland any experience or authority in insular matters?





